

# Kingborough Community Consultative Forum General Meeting

10.20am 11<sup>th</sup> June 2016  
Civic Centre, Kingston

## MINUTES

### Present:

Initials	Organisation	Representatives present
KCCF	Kingborough Community Consultative Forum	John Cox (Chair)
		Tony Ferrier (Secretary)
BBPA	Blackmans Bay Progress Association	Wayne Burgess
CALSCA	Coningham & Lower Snug Community Ass.	Mike Jackson
FNB	Friends of North Bruny	Di Blackwood
HPA	Howden Progress Association	June Walker
KCA	Kettering Community Association	Neil Broomfield, Chris Ireland
KBCA	Kingston Beach Community Association	Santhe Parker
KLAG	Kingborough Land Care Advisory Group	John Cox
TCA	Taroona High School Association	Gina Hurn
	Unaligned	Rob Crosthwaite

**Council:** Mayor Steve Wass, Cr Sue Bastone, Gary Arnold (General Manager), Tony Ferrier (Deputy General Manager)

**Apologies:** Peter Laud (KCA), Gloria Lonergan (SCRA), Cr Dr Graham Bury

### Business:

#### 1. Welcome (Chair)

Wayne Burgess, as the new Chairman, introduced himself and welcomed everyone.

#### 2. Minutes of the General Meeting held 5 March 2016

It was agreed that the Minutes were an accurate account of the previous meeting.

#### 3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Neil Broomfield asked about the progress of the community resilience report. Wayne Burgess produced a copy of the draft report and said that there was a recent meeting of the groups that had been previously consulted. The results of this consultation with four of these groups are included within the report and the Bruny Island consultation is yet to be incorporated. It is to be placed on Council's website. It is essentially a 'work in progress' and will identify gaps or shortcomings in how local communities can best respond to future emergencies.

#### 4. Report from Council

- (a) **Update on the current situation for Council in regard to Local Government reform**

Gary Arnold provided a summary of the current situation including the following matters:

- A greater Hobart feasibility study is being undertaken by consultants SGS Economics and Planning that in investigating resource sharing and amalgamation options amongst the greater Hobart councils of Hobart, Glenorchy, Clarence and Kingborough. A first draft discussion paper (desktop analysis) has been prepared by the consultant and the councils are being briefed on some of the initial conclusions.
- There is also a similar exercise being undertaken by KPMG consultants for Clarence, Sorell, Tasman and Glamorgan Spring Bay councils.
- In regard to Huon Valley Council, there was a formal meeting over a year ago that decided the respective General Managers would scope up an appropriate feasibility study. A draft was prepared by Kingborough but there has been no response from HVC.
- Huon Valley Council resolved at its meeting on 25 May 2016 to write to Kingborough Council in order to commence discussions on the “Huon D’Entrecasteaux Option” (Huon Valley municipal area, plus the Channel and Bruny components of Kingborough – with Kingston and Tarooma to be incorporated within Hobart). This is the only option that HVC is prepared to discuss. Kingborough Council will consider the situation at a meeting in late June.

During subsequent discussion it was noted that both Kingborough and Huon Valley councils are debt free, and that the inquiry into the HVC probably means that its actual future is quite uncertain.

#### **(b) Update on Council long term financial plan and budget for 2016/17**

At its meeting on 6 June 2016, Council adopted its budget for the 2016/17 financial year. Gary Arnold described the main points to note as being:

- A lot of work has been done this year in reviewing the Council’s Long Term Financial Plan – including five councillor workshops. This plan emphasizes Council’s long term financial sustainability. Kingborough is a growing municipality with increasing infrastructure demands. Council needs to provide a wide variety of services, gaps need to be addressed and there are many competing priorities.
- The LTFP is based on a number of assumptions – these being rate increases of 4% per annum; the introduction of a stormwater removal rate; fees and charges increased in line with CPI; employee costs in line with the existing EBA and no increase in FTE numbers; material and contract costs to increase at 1.5% per annum until 2020 (1% below expected inflation rate); depreciation increases will be 4.5% per annum; and funding for asset renewal is set at 80% of depreciation. The existing Barretta levy is to be removed.
- Council has an underlying financial deficit of about \$1.0M which will be brought into surplus by 2020. This would be a strong achievement in light of increasing depreciation and maintenance costs for Council.
- For next year, rates will increase on average between 3-4%. This is required to meet the LTFP objectives and to maintain current service levels. For a residential property valued at \$380,000, the increase amounts to \$44.70 a year or 86 cents a week.

A video was played that outlined the results of the Kingston Beach climate change project. It depicts the recent work done by Council in determining the likely future impact of climate change on Kingston Beach. There is an accompanying report that provides further detail. It was suggested that both be placed on Council’s website.

**(c) Update on State planning reform – the proposed State Planning Provisions as part of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme**

Tony Ferrier reported on the following related matters:

- Following the public exhibition of the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (KIPS) hearings were held at the Tasmanian Planning Commission in late February 2016. The Commission has since determined what changes may be necessary and has sought a response from Council – which is currently being processed. Some immediate changes to the existing KIPS can then be approved.
- This process however will soon be overtaken by the development of what is being referred to (in legislation) as the Tasmanian Planning Scheme. The way land is currently zoned within the KIPS will nevertheless inform the land is zoned in the subsequent version.
- The State Government has prepared draft State Planning Provisions (as part of the proposed Tasmanian Planning Scheme) and these were publicly released with comments due on 18 May. Council prepared its own submission (a copy can be found on the Council's website) and a list of the main concerns were as follows:
  - *Zoning gaps exist in that there is no capacity to accommodate lower residential densities within urban areas. There is a need for other categories of the Low Density Residential and General Residential Zones that allow for larger minimum lot sizes and the capacity to prohibit unit developments.*
  - *Within rural areas there is a similar need for a zone category that allows for larger rural residential lots. Properties that are currently zoned Environmental Living are not easily accommodated within the proposed zoning framework.*
  - *The proposed zoning framework will result in the need for extensive areas in Kingborough to be included within the Rural Zone and this will be incompatible with the inevitable proximity to residential areas.*
  - *The deletion of the Stormwater Code will mean that stormwater impacts from larger development proposals (residential units, retail, commercial, industrial, parking etc) will not be able to be assessed and permits appropriately conditioned.*
  - *The deletion of the On-site Wastewater Code will mean that site limitations in unsewered areas will not be able to be assessed and the development proposal designed to best accommodate future on-site wastewater disposal requirements.*
  - *The Attenuation Code should apply to the Light Industrial, General Industrial, Port and Marine or Utilities zones.*
  - *The Bushfire Prone Areas Code should ensure that bushfire hazard assessments are part of the planning approval process.*
  - *The Natural Assets Code should apply to all zones and should be consistent with the Forest Practices Regulations.*
  - *The overlay for the Scenic Protection Code should not be restricted to any particular zones and should be applied to any area that is worthy of scenic protection.*
  - *Review the deletion of the Environmental Living Zone and, if it is not to be used, then issue zoning guidelines in regard to how affected properties that will need to be rezoned.*
  - *There are no provisions that enable an assessment of potential noise impacts and a reliance on subsequent investigations of environmental nuisance complaints will prove to be inadequate, costly and exacerbate local conflict.*

- *Constraints on the height of coastal development should be retained and should be extended to include residential areas.*
  - *The performance criteria standards need to be reviewed in order to minimise potential uncertainties and misinterpretation.*
  - *The proposed State Planning Provisions are not underpinned by any clearly expressed policy positions. Policy and strategy should have preceded the development of the regulatory implementation framework.*
- The Tasmanian Planning Commission will be conducting hearings to consider the submissions from throughout the State and, after this, will recommend to the Minister the final version of the State Planning Provisions. Following this, the Councils (as the local Planning Authorities) will be instructed to prepare the Local Provision Schedules in order to complete the individual planning schemes.
  - The State provisions include all of the operational provisions (definitions, exemptions etc), the Zone use and development standards, and all of the Codes (a suite of state-wide Codes will be prepared) – these will be standard and unchanged in all planning schemes. The Local provisions include the zoning maps and Specific Area Plans (plus local area objectives, particular purpose zones and site specific qualifications).
  - Council is currently revising the Kingborough Land Use Strategy (Dec 2013) in order that it can help in guiding or justifying the further development of Local provisions.
  - Future amendments to the eventual planning scheme will either be done by Ministerial Directives (for State Planning Provisions) or by existing statutory processes (for Local Planning Provisions) – this planning will be centralized more within government as part of a desire of greater uniformity – the actual implications of this in regard to on-the-ground impacts and local character are yet to be well understood.

This generated a number of questions and comments from Forum members. There was some cynicism in regard to the government's agenda and that the draft State Planning Provisions had been prepared by the Planning Taskforce. Concerns were expressed that the process had been politicized, that many of the proposed provisions would be legally invalid (contrary to RMPS objectives) and that local community concerns were being disregarded. It was felt that the proposed State Provisions do not take into account all of the thorough work done in preparing the Interim Planning Schemes. There was also a concern that the Planning Commission will not have sufficient time to adequately consider these new draft provisions.

There was also a general concern that the general public does not appreciate the future impact of these changes. People will not be interested until they are directly affected – either as a proponent or an affected neighbour. Council possibly needs to do more in this regard and Forum members should alert their respective organisations. The government's mantra of "faster, fairer, simpler, cheaper" planning schemes can be interpreted as being only in the interests of developers rather than local communities. There are many more permitted or as-of-right developments. Another concern was that the legislation places so much individual power in the Minister.

Wayne Burgess described how there are concerns in Blackmans Bay about the loss of character due to the planning scheme encouraging much higher densities from infill development. He said there is a new Tasmanian Planning Information Network (TasPIN) that has been established by about a dozen different organisations across southern Tasmania (see website [www.taspin.net](http://www.taspin.net) ).

**(d) Central Kingston projects – proposed road upgrades, parking strategy and redevelopment of old high school site (naming competition, community hub design etc)**

Tony Ferrier provided a brief outline of the following matters:

- Consultants are currently preparing road designs for the Boulevard road within the KHS site, John Street (specifically the northern and southern intersections) and that section of the Channel Highway between Hutchins Street and John Street. These designs will be further discussed with affected landowners and publicly released for comment as part of a development application. After this the more detailed engineering designs will be completed later in 2016 in order to facilitate the road construction works. At this stage it is envisaged that the Boulevard will be constructed early in 2017 and the other works (upgrading the Channel Highway) a year later.
- A parking strategy for central Kingston has been prepared and will be soon considered by Council. This strategy has been prepared in order to consider the future changes associated with future development within Kingston, in particular the KHS redevelopment (including the loss of existing temporary all-day car parking). The final parking strategy will be one that enables Council to explain how these parking issues will be addressed in future and will assist in guiding future development proposals.
- The architectural competition for the Community Hub facility is nearing completion following the independent Jury having assessed all of the initial submissions. The five shortlisted architects have presented their concept designs to the Jury and a decision has been made on the winning design and this will be announced next week. Council will now be working with this particular architect in the more detailed design and the eventual construction of this particular facility.
- Council has also carried out a public “naming” competition – in order to replace the need to continually refer to the site and project as the “former Kingston High School site”. A panel of community representatives reduced the many suggested names down to five “finalists” and public comment has now been sought on these different options.
- Council submitted a grant application in Round 3 of the National Stronger Regions Fund (NSRF) program. An announcement of the successful grants will be made in July 2016. This application was for \$5M and aims to address the likely funding shortfall for the overall project and to accelerate its implementation. It would be mainly used to assist in funding the construction of the Boulevard, the Community Hub facility and the recreational areas within the designated public open space.

Wayne Burgess reported on a number of items in the State government’s budget for 2016/17, including an additional \$5.9M for the proposed Integrated Care Centre facility on the KHS site.

**(e) Future Kingborough tourism marketing proposals**

Tony Ferrier provided a brief report in regard to the following matters:

- Council has resolved to no longer utilise the *Huon Trail* brand to market the area south of Hobart to tourists. A new arrangement has been endorsed that involves Destination Southern Tasmania (as the regional tourism authority) to develop a marketing plan for Kingborough – and separately (though complementary) for Huon Valley. A reference group has been established to help coordinate this work – consisting of representatives from DST, the two councils and the local tourism industry (including two representatives each from Bruny Island and the Channel).

DST has also been commissioned to further develop existing marketing efforts (brochures, website, signage, events, advertising etc).

- DST is also facilitating the preparation of a Destination Action Plan for Bruny Island. This is one such Plan of many that are being prepared across Tasmania (and the rest of the country) and will provide a strategic framework for how we can best respond to the increasing tourism pressures being felt by this particular destination. DST is doing this on behalf of the State Government. A facilitated workshop has been held and another will be conducted soon, followed by the preparation of a report that recommends the most critical actions that are required to be implemented in the next few years.
- Bruny Island is also being further investigated from the specific perspective of “visitor engagement”. Place-making consultants are undertaking a pilot project on Bruny Island that will detail physical and digital projects that can improve the visitor experience and be used as a case study for the rest of the state.

There was a subsequent discussion about the capacity of Bruny Island to receive more tourists and the degree to which the resident community appreciates this increased tourism popularity. Neil Broomfield also commented on the adverse impacts on Kettering, in particular the long ferry queues and the need for more public toilets. Neil also said that designated sites for overnight camping (eg campervans) need to be identified. In response to this, the Forum was informed that Council has commissioned a report into the need for such camping sites and if necessary then where and how they may be provided. It was also reported that, in regard to Bruny Island, Council is proposed new public toilet facilities at Alannah and the State government is funding some major improvements at the Neck.

## **5. Reports from Community Organisations**

Gina Hurn reported on the Taroona High School’s upcoming Ember contemporary music festival that will be held in two weeks’ time.

Mike Jackson reported on the 8-day festival proposed to celebrate Margate’s 150 year anniversary which will be held in the last week of June. There have been recent advertisements in the Kingborough Chronicle.

Santhe Parker reported on the Kingston Beach Community Association which was established about one year ago. She asked if the previously shown video could be provided to the Association and she suggested that Council consult earlier or more widely with the Kingston Beach community on such matters.

John Cox reported (from a Landcare perspective) on the worsening weed problems (particularly Spanish Heath) within the highway road reserves. These roadsides are maintained under contract (by Stornoway) for the Department of State Growth. Council’s NRM staff would be aware of the problem but will make further enquiries.

Rob Crosthwaite asked about Council’s current involvement with the Sea Change organisation (now called Australian Coastal Councils Association) and it was confirmed that it is no longer a member, though still monitors its activities. Rob also asked, in regard to the detailed Kingston Beach investigation, if Council could undertake similar exercises for such other areas as Snug and Adventure Bay. The response to this was that, yes Council would like to do this, but Kingston Beach has to date required a great deal of effort and can’t be easily replicated elsewhere.

June Walker reported on the TasWater consultation for the proposed sewerage pipeline. A decision is yet to be made and a further update on progress is not expected until August. It is likely that cost will be a consideration and not just what the affected community wants. It is disappointing that this process is taking so long. The proposed coastal walking track at

Howden is still waiting on news about a grant application. June asked as to whether the aforementioned community resilience report took into account issues relating to Howden – such as that in a bushfire local residents have in the past been told to go to the golf course but this road may be blocked. This question was taken on notice.

## **6. Other Business**

Gary Arnold reported that many local groups would have worked with Council's Ian Holloway in the past and that Ian has recently announced that he will be retiring on the 8<sup>th</sup> July. Ian recently provided a presentation to the Forum. Forum members expressed their appreciation for the past work that Ian done in assisting the various groups.

## **7. Next KCCF Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on 3 September 2016 however a specific request has been made for this to now be **17 September**. In the absence of any other objections, this will now be the meeting date.

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.